

And now we have before this body the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill.

During his state of the union address last January, the President called for the Justice Department to prepare a "litigation plan" against the tobacco companies to reclaim hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars spent through federal health-care programs such as Medicare to treat smoking-related illnesses.

But this bill does something quite different. The language in the committee report on the Commerce, State, Justice Bill attempts to grant immunity to the tobacco industry from any federal litigation. Instead of a litigation plan, this bill would create a protection plan for the tobacco companies.

I hope my colleagues in this body would agree that the Justice Department must be able to pursue litigation based on the law, and that we should do everything in our power to enable the department to enforce the law.

But the language currently in the committee report prevents the Justice Department from enforcing the law. So instead of a huge federal lawsuit, the tobacco industry will have immunity from federal litigation. It looks like the tobacco companies have really gotten what they wanted in this bill, Mr. President.

It's a fortunate turn of events for the tobacco companies, but based on the tobacco industry's track record of political donations and political clout, I can't say that it's surprising.

The nation's tobacco companies are some of the most generous political donors around today, Mr. President, including Philip Morris, which reigns as the largest single soft money donor of all time. During the 1997-1998 election cycle the tobacco companies, including Philip Morris, RJR Nabisco, Brown and Williamson, US Tobacco and the industry's lobbying arm, the Tobacco Institute, gave a combined \$5.5 million dollars in soft money to the parties, and another \$2.3 million in PAC money contributions to candidates.

I offer this information to my colleagues and to the public to paint a clearer picture of who is trying to influence the bill before us, and how they are using the campaign finance system—very successfully, I might add—to get what they want from this bill and this Congress.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1217, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Bill for 2000.

This bill provides new budget authority of \$34 billion and new outlays of \$23.1 billion to finance the programs of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and the federal judiciary.

I congratulate the Chairman and Ranking Member for producing a bill that complies with the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. This is one of the

most difficult bills to manage with its varied programs and challenging allocation, but I think the bill meets most of the demands made of it while not exceeding its budget. So I commend my friend, the chairman, for his efforts and leadership.

When outlays from prior-year BA and other adjustments are taken into account, the bill totals \$34.1 billion in BA and \$34 billion in outlays. For general purpose activities as well as crime funding, the bill is at the Senate subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

I ask members of the Senate to refrain from offering amendments which would cause the subcommittee to exceed its budget allocation and urge the speedy adoption of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1217, COMMERCE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—
SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
(Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-Reported Bill:				
Budget authority	29,460	4,150	523	34,133
Outlays	28,214	5,271	529	34,014
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	29,460	4,150	523	34,133
Outlays	28,214	5,271	529	34,014
1999 level:				
Budget authority	27,165	5,509	523	33,197
Outlays	26,364	4,369	529	31,262
President's request:				
Budget authority	32,347	4,216	523	37,086
Outlays	31,327	4,538	529	36,394
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority				
Outlays				
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority				
Outlays				
1999 level:				
Budget authority	2,295	(1,359)		936
Outlays	1,850	902		2,752
President's request:				
Budget authority	(2,887)	(66)		(2,953)
Outlays	(3,113)	733		(2,380)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	29,460	4,150	523	34,133
Outlays	28,214	5,271	529	34,014

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill will be read the third time and passed.

The bill S. 1217, as amended, was read the third time, and passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators per-

mitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MILLENNIUM DIGITAL COMMERCE ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise to address the need for prompt action on S. 761, the Millennium Digital Commerce Act. Senator ABRAHAM has crafted a solid legislative measure that will promote continued growth in electronic commerce.

The Millennium Digital Commerce Act has 11 cosponsors including Senators WYDEN, TORRICELLI, MCCAIN, BURNS, FRIST, GORTON, BROWNBACK, ALLARD, GRAMS, HAGEL, and myself.

Mr. President, on June 23, almost one month ago, the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously approved and ordered S. 761 reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This substitute is widely supported by the States, industry, and the administration. In fact, on June 22, the day before the mark-up, the Commerce Department issued a formal letter of support for this bipartisan measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Administration's letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

Washington, DC, June 22, 1999.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter conveys the views of the Department of Commerce on the substitute version of S. 761, the "Millennium Digital Signature Act," that we understand will be marked-up by the Senate Commerce Committee. A copy of the substitute that serves as the basis for these views is attached to this letter.

In July 1997 the Administration issued the Framework for Global Electronic Commerce, wherein President Clinton and Vice President Gore recognized the importance of developing a predictable, minimalist legal environment in order to promote electronic commerce. President Clinton directed Secretary Daley "to work with the private sector, State and local governments, and foreign governments to support the development, both domestically and internationally, of a uniform commercial legal framework that recognizes, facilitates, and enforces electronic transactions worldwide."

Since July 1997, we have been consulting with countries to encourage their adoption of an approach to electronic authentication that will assure parties that their transactions will be recognized and enforced globally. Under this approach, countries would: (1) eliminate paper-based legal barriers to electronic transactions by implementing the relevant provisions of the 1996 UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce; (2) reaffirm the rights of parties to determine for themselves the appropriate technological means of authenticating their transactions;